Controversy on assessment of poverty

†*105. SHRI JANESHWAR MISHRA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a massive controversy has arisen regarding the manner in which the assessment of poverty is made;

(b) whether it is also a fact that as per the thinking of certain States, they are facing injustice and loss inspite of their better performance in many programmes; and

(c) whether Government would prepare a new formula in the matter of poverty assessment in consultation with various State Government?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STATISTICS AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND PUBLIC GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): (a) The methodology of poverty estimation at national and state level adopted by the Planning Commission is based on the recommendations of the Expert Group on Estimation of Proportion and Number of Poor. The Group was chaired by Professor D.T. Lakdawala and had the leading experts on poverty measurement in India as members.

(b) The Planning Commission has received representation from the State Governments of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Orissa in the matter of choice of the methodology of estimation of poverty. The State Government of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka urged that in estimating poverty the impact of the price depressing effect of the food subsidy scheme, funded from the State Exchequer, be eliminated.The Government of Andhra Pradesh at a later stage urged that estimates be made on the earlier methodology of poverty estimation, known as the Task Force method. The Government of Orissa has urged that the national level poverty line be adopted for estimating poverty in the State.

(c) After carefully considering the representations, the Planning

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

Commission has decided to continue with the Expert Group methodology.

Increased size of administration

†*106. SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMOOWALIA:
SHRI RAJ MOHINDER SINGH:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the size of administration has increased over the years;

(b) if so, the number of posts of level of Cabinet Minister, Secretary, Additional Secretary, Joint Secretary and Deputy Secretary that increased during the years 1997-98, 1998-99 and first 10 months of 1999-2000; and

(c) the annual additional expenditure on the country caused due to appointments made against such increased posts?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND PUBLIC GRIEVANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF PERSONNEL, PUBLIC GRIEVANCES AND PENSIONS (SHRI ARUN SHOURIE): (a) to (c) The number of sanctioned (civilian) posts in the Central Government as on 31st March, 1996, 31st March, 1997 and 31st March, 1998 was 42.18 lakhs, 42.18 lakhs and 41.93 lakhs respectively. There was a marginal decrease of the order of about 25,000 in the number of sanctioned posts as on 31st March, 1998 compared to 31st March, 1996. Against the above mentioned sanctioned strength, the actual number of employees in position was 38.93 lakhs on 31st March, 1996, 38.95 lakhs on 31st March,' 1997 and 38.47 lakhs on 31st March, 1998.

The number of Cabinet Ministers during 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 (April 1999—January 2000) was 22, 22 and 29 respectively. During 1997-98, the number had increased by 1 over the previous year (i.e. 1996-97). There was no increase during 1998-99. The number increased by 7 during 1999-2000 (April 1999—January 2000). Thus the overall increase in the number of Cabinet Ministers during 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 was 8,

The requisite information with respect to increase in the number

† Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.